1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

605 612 a wide circle of kin. It is entirely consistent with these needs that the collateral extension of the kindred is wider in a person's own generation than in either the first ascendant or descendant generations. As the children of a family approach adult status, a father through the identification of his interests with those of his children, is drawn less into the affairs of his own cousins and becomes more concerned with the cousins of his children's kindred, who from his point of view include affinal relatives as well as the children of his own siblings and first cousins.

605 The essence of cousinhood, as indeed of all collateral kinship, is that measure of confidence and altruism to which we have referred more than once. Cousins are the children or grandchildren of siblings and the values of cousinship contain the ideal that their affections are like those of brothers and sisters. Cousins are genuinely concerned about each others' successes or misfortunes, hopes and fears. When a man meets a cousin after a long interval of time there is obvious pleasure on both sides. They find a quiet corner away from other people and a conversation begins which, if circumstances allow, may continue for many hours. There is a certain conventional sequence of topics. At first there are detailed inquiries about the health of each member of the two families. This is followed by an exchange of information about sheep and grazing, marriages and match-making in either family or amongst their kinsmen. Afterwards the talk ranges in random fashion over many subjects, the local personalities and gossip of their villages, the latest oppressive measure of government bureaucrats. What is so striking about the private talk of kinsmen is its fluency, freedom, and its mellow modulated tones. It presents a striking contrast with the talk of unrelated Sarakatsani in the forum of the village square or coffee-shop. There, conversation is a contest of wits, cast in a compulsively restrained monosyllabic form, yet accompanied with the striking of assertive attitudes. It is not intended as a means for exchanging information but rather as a form of protagonistic competition.

605 836 There are certain kinds of general social intercourse which are possible only between kinsmen, more especially between cousins. For the Sarakatsani, marriage and sexual relations cannot be separated. A girl who loses her honour is in danger of her life at the hands of her own family. The importance of virginity

[684] 000

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

612 578 539 'Why is the wound in your eye so deep? Because my kinsman gouged it out' (γιατί'ν'τὸ μάτι σου βαθειὰ βγαλμένο; — γιατί μοῦ τό'βγαλε ξυάδι), expresses precisely this difference. The proverb,

612 574 578 Between kinsmen who co-operate in a 'company' for the co-management of their flocks it is almost inevitable that from time to time differing interests produce a coolness in their relations. Yet it is remarkable how seldom these frictions develop into the kind of quarrel which causes an irreparable breach. A stern self-control is maintained by these kinsmen on their injured feelings because they know that they depend on each other's assistance in the struggle to survive the hazards, natural and political, which surround them. However, any form of dishonesty in their co-operative handling of the flocks destroys the [685] basis of their association. Recently a cousin who was herding his sheep with a 'company' of married brothers was discovered during the lambing season in the act of trying to attach a number of his kinsmen's newly born ewe lambs to his own ewes, and his own male lambs to the ewes which he had robbed. Inevitably, after such an incident, the trust between these kinsmen was permanently broken.

835 612 605 Incest (αἱμομιξία) represents the most dramatic form of deception that one kinsman can practise on another. Unmarried cousins of opposite sex enjoy an easy, friendly companionship with one another which they are denied with unrelated persons. Very occasionally a youth succumbs to the temptation of sexual experiments with a young kinswoman, an act in which he may destroy both the girl's honour and his own. It seems most unlikely that these affairs, if protracted, can ever remain secret in a community where there are so many questioning eyes. Over

835 605 558 a period of ten years I discovered three probable instances, of which one was incest between first cousins. In this case a youth was staying in his uncle's house and there, it seems, seduced the unmarried daughter. The cousin had left his uncle's house before it became apparent that the girl was pregnant, and he naturally denied from a distance that he had had any hand in the matter. The girl for her part claimed that she had been impregnated by divine, not human, means, but little attention was paid to this suggestion. The girl's family did not take any drastic action [684] in the matter beyond disposing of the child when it was born. The girl herself was allowed to live; and in fact, a year or two

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

The girl herself was allowed to live; and in fact, a year or two later was married off to a poor widower who extracted a considerable dowry in consideration of her blemished history. Although the girl had an unmarried brother no action was ever taken against the alleged seducer. The family claimed that it would not be right to kill a first cousin (any more than a brother) whatever the crime committed, and there are those who agree that there was some force in this argument. But there are others who do not hold this view and believe that the family made a virtue of a dishonourable preference. In any case the family emerged from this affair with its honour destroyed. Needless to say, all forms of social intercourse have ceased between the kinsmen concerned. This involved the destruction of the relationship between the brothers who were the heads of the two families. Incest between first cousins is a sin, for the same blood turns in upon itself in the pollution of sexual intercourse. It is something which goes against nature and something also which inevitably wrecks the whole scheme of kinship relations.

Sexual intercourse between second cousins is still described as incest but it cannot be said in quite the same way that it is an act which goes against nature. Second cousins are kinsmen but they are, also, nearly 'strangers'. Men know that in the towns the Church, from time to time, solemnizes marriages between second cousins, and that in two notorious instances in recent years such marriages have even been contracted by Sarakatsani. But so far as premarital sex relations are concerned the choice here lies between calling them incest or fornication. Whichever term is chosen to describe the liaison, it is less an unnatural sin than conduct of the deepest dishonour. As one man put it with ironic scorn, 'It would be better to marry your own sister' (καλλίτερα νὰ στεφανωθῇς τὴν ἀδερφή σου). But although an illicit affair between second cousins is serious enough, for it inevitably destroys the girl's honour and the relationship between the two parents who are first cousins, it does not have quite the same catastrophic consequences for family and kindred relationships as incest between first cousins.

It is clear, then, that where there is a flagrant breach of the norms of kinship, the relationship is annulled. The trust which is the basis of kinship relations is an axiomatic value in Sarakatsan life which is never questioned. From the injured kinsman's point of view there can be no extenuating circumstances which

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

612 183 in time, and after long consideration, may provide the offender with an excuse. There is no basis for forgiveness and reconciliation.

612 626 The support of kinsmen is also withdrawn sometimes in a manner which does not necessarily imply a permanent rupture of social relations, though it may come to this in the end. I have previously emphasized the importance of the moral support of kinsmen when the community is evaluating a man's conduct.

[539] The idea that a man must defend the actions of his kinsmen is expressed in the proverb, 'Ο δικός μπορεῖ νὰ πῇ μὰ δὲν μπορεῖ ν'ἀκούσῃ. Literally this means, 'A relation can speak to his kinsman but he cannot listen to something about him', that is to say he can scold a kinsman for his shortcomings in private, but he will not allow others to accuse him in public. This in general is true, but it depends upon the possibility of advancing some reasonable explanation of a kinsman's conduct. Where a man has behaved in a manner clearly at variance with the values of the community a kinsman is forced to abandon him, and even to take some part in condemning his conduct. For if he continues to support his cause his own reputation and that of his family will suffer. By condemning the actions of his kinsmen he expresses in an unequivocal fashion that he supports the values of the community; and he maintains a measure of social distance between himself and his kinsman. In this way he hopes to avoid the taint of association with his conduct and the shame which accompanies it.

● 684 612 629 The history of Nasios illustrates this process. One afternoon in the summer of 1953 he happened to meet Mitrina Mastoras on the hill-side above his village, and there, after failing to win her willing co-operation, he attempted to take her 'by force' (μὲ τὸ ζόρι); but unsuccessfully according to Mitrina's story. The terrified woman ran down the hill to the huts of her second cousin for, at the time, her own husband was away from home. The cousin at once sent word to the husband who returned immediately. He surprised Nasios, knocked him to the ground, and had already drawn his knife to settle the matter when he was seized from behind by two villagers. In terror Nasios escaped to his home.

Public opinion was unanimous in condemning Nasios. This was not the first time he had attacked women, although on the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

two previous occasions he had more wisely confined his attentions to gipsy women. His family was in any case poor and of low prestige. There was nothing at all to be said in his favour. He had a number of kinsmen among the Sarakatsani who graze the lands of the same village, and of these the closest was Evangelos Balatsos, a first cousin. Evangelos and the other kinsmen all joined in the universal condemnation of Nasios. During the weeks which followed Evangelos made a point of going each day to the home of Nasios and unnerving him with imaginary accounts of the plots and ambushes which the husband of Mitrina was preparing to lure him to his death. So thorough were his efforts that for the next two months, until the Sarakatsani left for the winter pastures, Nasios was never seen outside his hut in daylight. Evangelos after his daily visits to Nasios made his way to the coffee-shop where he described to an appreciative audience the state of affairs in Nasios's household, how he remained each night, sleepless behind the door with axe in hand, and how his wife was obliged under cover of darkness to remove his faeces from the hut. In this fashion Evangelos took a leading part in the shaming of his kinsman, and saved his own name by denying solidarity with his kinsman and damaging his reputation.

The possibility of losing the moral and practical support of kinsmen, perhaps for ever, is clearly a most powerful sanction of the norms of kinship behaviour and the values of the wider community. If Nasios, a poor man who herded the sheep of villagers, had possessed a substantial flock and had therefore been dependent on the help of kinsmen in a 'company', this estrangement from his kinsmen would have affected him even more seriously than it did. It is also evident that the application of this sanction by the kinsman is itself sanctioned by the threat that a man and his family may lose prestige if he does not temporarily abandon the evil-doer. Since the interests of the family always take precedence over obligations of individual collateral kinship, there is never any doubt that a man will conform. We see, not for the first time, the connexion between prestige values and the isolation of the family; for these values necessarily threaten the solidarity of any personal relationship or social grouping which may conflict with a man's duty to uphold, or promote, the prestige of his family.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

ordinary dowry. Yet the Sarakatsani say of such a bridegroom that his fate is 'worse than that of a skinned fox' (χειρότερα ἀπὸ τὴν γδαρμένη ἀλεποῦ).

A man never entirely trusts his affines. Yet precisely because of the co-operative compact which has been established and their equal concern for children who will claim both sets of affines as blood kinsmen, close affinal relatives must give positive proof of seeming to trust one another. A man will sometimes entrust his unmarried sister to the care of a sister's husband or a sister's husband's brother. When Patra Achnoulas went to Athens to see an eye specialist, her sister's husband, who also had business in the capital, accompanied her. It is reasoned correctly that only a mentally deranged person would act dishonourably in such a situation since his punishment at the hands of the community would be ostracism. Yet such is the suspicious attitude adopted towards affines that the Sarakatsani have many stories, no doubt spurious in the main, about illicit sexual intercourse between a bridegroom and his wife's sister; although it is true that these cautionary tales generally involve villagers or gipsies and not Sarakatsani. The true incidence of such affairs amongst the Sarakatsani themselves is probably very low; I could discover only one case, and that did not occur in recent years. If we speak generally of breaches of trust, it may be said that where these occur between kinsmen they produce a feeling of horror akin to the reaction to treason in our own society; but where the breach of trust is between affines the shock rather prompts a degree of criticism that, affines being what they are, a man did not take more care.

4. SOME STRUCTURAL IMPLICATIONS

The marriage contract which establishes affinal relations between two previously unrelated families is unique and may not be repeated. For instance, two brothers may not marry two sisters, although they are permitted to marry women related as first cousins. Like the prohibition on marriage in the kindred this reinforces the tendency towards the isolation of the family from collateral kinsmen. The suggestion that if the first marriage were successful it might be a good thing for two brothers to be married to two sisters is met with shocked incredulity. 'They have made one blood. They must search

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

593 Publicly a husband addresses his wife in a stern severe voice. Requests are commands, barked out in sharp phrases. It is important for a man's self-regard (ἐγωϊσμός) that other men should see that he is master in his own house. In public the wife is meek and modest, silent and submissive. She does not smile at him or laugh with him before strangers. But in the seclusion of the hut matters are otherwise. She abandons the mask of expressionless humility and discusses with her husband all the affairs of the family, putting forward her own suggestions in a respectful but fearless fashion. Yet even here respect is implicit and a wife must never use tones of mockery or abuse towards her husband.

626 Obedience to her husband is a moral imperative for the wife. She will not be excused by public opinion, however badly she may have been treated by the man. She cannot refuse to co-
593 habit with him sexually. Conversely, the act of disobedience
839 by which she damages her husband most severely is adultery.
558 In adultery she makes her husband a cuckold (κερατᾶς), one who wears a horn. 'She puts horns on him' (τοῦ βάζει κέρατα), it is said. The implication that the cuckold wears a horn may be an ironical allusion to the sexual potency which his wife's action suggests he does not possess.[1] Adultery attacks the moral integrity and honour of the family and makes a laughing-stock
684 of its leader and head. Thus, Sarakatsani always insist that if a husband surprises the guilty parties in the act, he must first kill his wife and then her seducer. The axiomatic acceptance of family obligations, the uncompromising character of the sanction, and the extreme difficulty of conducting such a liaison secretly, are all factors which contribute to the extremely low incidence of adultery. Indeed, since 1950, there appears to have been only one clear and unambiguous case of discovered adultery.

593 The disobedience of the wife in the sense of flatly refusing to do the spoken bidding of her husband is also rare. This situation or the mutual irritation which arises over the 'trivia' of communal living results in the wife receiving a beating with a stick. The Sarakatsani of both sexes accept the right of a husband to
577 strike a disobedient or erring wife. It is also true, however, that men who are continually beating their wives (and certain men

[1] Cf. Pitt-Rivers, op. cit., p. 116; and Onians, op. cit., p. 243.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

already arisen between them, and from that age she is expected in front of strangers to show him respect by standing when he sits and helping her mother to wait on her father and his guests. By the time a girl is seventeen there is a noticeable neutrality of tone in her conversation with her father. She is careful to avoid any reference to sexual matters or the possibility of her marriage. They are both conscious of the categorical obligations they owe to one another and the severe penalties which sanction their fulfilment. If a father does not arrange an honourable and successful marriage for his daughter, his reputation in the community is diminished. If a daughter does not preserve her virginity and her reputation for virginity, she faces death possibly; or, should she avoid this fate, she must certainly endure dishonour and a dishonourable marriage to a widower or a poor man of ill repute. Although between puberty and marriage a daughter receives almost all her instructions from her mother, her father, to whom she is subordinate both by reason of sex and generation, remains the ultimate source of authority.

* * *

At thirteen, when a boy leaves school, he generally begins his working life as a goatherd. He comes at once under the direction of his father who in his role of leader and co-ordinator of the family labour group exerts a stronger authority over the boy than he has yet experienced in his relations with his father. A son is now careful to show his father respect. Occasional lapses in correct behaviour towards a father are not taken too seriously while a boy is still at school. He is, then, still a child and is in an obvious sense under the power and instruction of his father and the school teacher. He cannot, however rebellious his nature, become independent at this stage. The boy leaves school at an age which coincides approximately with the onset of puberty and at the same time he becomes a full and responsible working member of the family under his father's leadership. He still offers no threat to his father's position as leader, yet his sexual maturity and the responsibilities of his new status in the family foreshadow the inevitable retirement of the father shortly after the marriage of his eldest son. The firm authority exerted by the father at this stage, and the required attitude of

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

593 contingency and reciprocity enters into the relationship. A son must give his father respect, be an efficient worker, and above all else show that he is a courageous protagonist of his family. The love and esteem of the father depend on his performance in these matters. By the time a son has returned from his military service, the conditional element in the relationship is increasingly on the side of the son, who avoids showing public disrespect to his father and continues to accept his authority on the understanding that the father, for his [888] part, respects his son's maturing social personality. After the retirement of the father, the sons in the extended family are under an absolute obligation to care for the old man, but the degree of their concern for his comfort may vary according to the past history of their relations. The conditional character of the affection of the father for a daughter is even more pro- [684] nounced. If the girl's reputation for virtue remains unblemished, she receives his favour; if it does not, she may suffer the ulti- 593 mate sanction of death at the hands of her own father. In turn, 584 the attitude of a married daughter to her father is contingent on whether he has given her to a good husband of an honourable [579] family. The daughter of a rich and powerful family, forced against her will to marry her second cousin, swore to her father as she left her home that she would never set foot in it again. Such a case of a complete breach of trust and mutual esteem between father and daughter is rare; but there are also women who harbour resentment against their fathers because, as they allege, they were given to indifferent husbands in order to avoid the payment of a substantial dowry.

3. SIBLINGS

593 The idea of 'one blood' which they share in their common [827] filiation to the same parents is the value that underlies the impressive solidarity of siblings in the elementary family and their almost complete identification of interests. In the eyes of outsiders siblings are morally identified. Whatever, for good or ill, is suffered or achieved by one sibling is held to affect the other siblings to an almost equivalent degree. An insult to any member of the group is felt with the same resentment by all the [627] brothers and sisters. If the brothers are adult, the Sarakatsani believe that an unmarried brother is the right and appropriate person to redress the wrongs of rape and homicide.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

condition did not improve, she was returned to her father with the dowry. In the second instance, the bride discovered after the wedding ceremony that the bridegroom had a cleft palate. She succeeded in evading the embraces of her husband by feigning sickness and escaped in the night to her father's home. But once the blood of a woman's virginity has been dedicated to her marriage and the honour of her unborn children, the marriage bond is indestructible except in death.

Ideally a girl who has a premarital love affair should be killed. However, there have been cases where either the father or the brother had not the courage to do it, or was persuaded by the girl that she was raped rather than seduced. But where the fate of the mother may hang in the balance, that of the illegitimate child is never in doubt. It cannot be allowed to live in the community, a testimony to the dishonour of the girl's family. It is placed on a mule-path where it may perhaps be found by others and delivered to an orphanage before it dies. No trace of pity is felt for the infant, for it is a thing without honour and therefore scarcely to be considered human at all. In this community an individual cannot exist simply *qua* individual, he can only be taken account of and evaluated in relation to his family membership; and this implies membership within the group of a wedded pair and their legitimate offspring. To harbour in the family a bastard, only one of whose parents belonged to the group, would be a contradiction in terms. It seems clear that the impossibility of divorce and the destruction of illegitimate children are, in different ways, indices of the solidarity and exclusiveness of the corporate family group.

The property of the family is owned corporately. Although the father and, later, the elder brother administer it, it is never, in Sarakatsan thought, the individual 'dominion' of the head of the family. When the elder brother takes the place of his father, he does not succeed to an estate but only to an office. Speaking of the Indian Joint Family, Vinogradoff[1] suggests that the material goods belonging to it are regarded as a common stock of wealth providing means for the subsistence of its members. This applies equally to the Sarakatsan family. Of the sheep it is said, 'They guard us, they allow us to live' (μᾶς φυλᾶν,

[1] Sir Paul Vinogradoff, *Outlines of Historical Jurisprudence*, Oxford, 1920, vol. i, p. 265.

CONTINUED
ON
NEXT FICHE

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

μᾶς ζοῦν). Every member of the family has a right to draw on this common stock according to the needs of his status and situation. From it are drawn the dowries of the daughters, which sometimes exceed in value the patrimony of a brother. It is the family flock which must support the expenses of a son's higher education, or the cost of medical treatment in emergencies.

As we have observed in chapter four, no partition of the family property ought to occur before all the daughters have been married with dowries which represent their share of the commonwealth. Thereafter each son has a right to one share in the flock and any other property which the family may own. One further share is reserved for the support of the two parents if they are still alive when the joint property is divided, and this property passes with them into the family of the youngest son in which by custom they spend the last days of their life. If only one parent is alive at the time of partition, only a half share is retained for his or her support. When the old people eventually die, their sheep remain with the flock of the youngest son. This is not regarded as a form of ultimogeniture any more than the succession of the eldest brother to the office of family head is considered to be primogeniture. The additional wealth which passes to the youngest brother is thought to be only a just compensation for the support of the aged parents which, although it is a sacred duty, is also in their declining years of mental and physical feebleness a considerable burden.

The right of a son to a share in the flock of the corporate family may be implemented at any time after he reaches adult age, which today is judged to be his twenty-second or twenty-third year, on his return from military service. In practice, he will not claim this share until he is married and the father of children, yet if he should quarrel with his father or brothers and decide to leave the family before this time, or if he is driven out, he is entitled to his share of the family wealth. Normally, however bitter the quarrel, a son may not be disinherited. A father may drive his son out of the house but not out of his inheritance; unless he is guilty of some ultimate crime such as incest or fratricide.

We can see from these facts that in principle the father and his sons, by virtue of their common membership in the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

him there, drinking and putting on airs. I remembered that his brother Vasili drew blood from my brother. I could not stand it.' The consequences for the other man was a head wound from a broken bottle before the two men were parted and expelled from the wedding. It has to be remembered that fights and brawls in which individuals have the duty of both active and passive solidarity are relatively frequent, but that killings are rare.

The second category of affairs of honour concerns the sexual conduct of women. The family has exclusive rights over the sexual capacities of its women, and in this respect women always remain *in loco filiae*. Here we are concerned not only with external attack as in the spilling of blood, but also, sometimes, with treason from within when a daughter or sister betrays her virginity or when a wife voluntarily commits adultery. The will of a woman is vulnerable and her sensuality is evil. She is the weak link in the chain. For this very reason her sexual purity is an appropriate symbol of the family's honour. Its destruction, although itself a dishonourable act, in some way places the destroyer and his family in a position of superiority; for they have demonstrated that the woman is willing to abandon sacred loyalties for the gratification of her sensual feelings by a stranger. In these circumstances vengeance becomes primarily an act of purification. A father (or brother) must first destroy his daughter (or sister) and only afterwards turn his attention to the lover. Similarly, a husband ought first to kill a wife taken in adultery and then the paramour.

If it seems surprising that such violence may occur in a group whose jural and affective solidarity I have been at some pains to stress, this nevertheless seems to be a characteristic of small groups whose solidarity is very intense. In the mutual identification of one member with another, there is no flexibility to contain widely divergent interests. We have seen that brothers, if they cannot reach unanimous decisions, must part company. Similarly, the association of family members demands absolute loyalty; the treachery of one member disrupts the group in such a way that this member's very presence is a denial of the qualities and attitudes on which the harmony of its internal relations depends. The objectionable element must, therefore, be excised. This is the only way in which the family honour can be

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

reinstated. And the father[4] or brother who accomplishes this terrible work wins a grudging respect in the general community.

Families do not always find at once the moral strength to take the only honourable action. In an affair between two second cousins in 1955 near a village on Mitsikeli, the girl's brothers first tried unsuccessfully to kill her lover. The girl then ran away to the man's home; no doubt as much through fear of her family as out of devotion to her lover. In another case, which occurred in 1944, the lover of an unmarried girl escaped from the neighbourhood after one unsuccessful attempt to shoot him. Although the girl's association with the man had been notorious, no action was at first taken against her, but over a period of six months the family suffered acutely from public sneers and scorn until, quite suddenly, the girl disappeared. The nature of her fate was never satisfactorily explained.

The most recent instance of the vengeance of a family on a daughter occurred in 1948 when a Sarakatsanos wintering his sheep near the Gulf of Arta discovered that his daughter was conducting an affair with a villager, who had seduced her with false promises of marriage. At the time, there was no other Sarakatsan family in the immediate neighbourhood, so that there seemed to be some possibility of hushing up the matter; but the girl discovered that she was pregnant and the man refused to marry her.[5] The father took the girl to a secluded place, shot her with a pistol, and disposed of her body by rowing out into the gulf and sinking it with weights attached. Later, he killed the villager and dealt with his body in the same way. This case is often cited as the right solution to problems of this kind.

In cases where a girl is raped or a wife is similarly violated, or where at least the community accepts this presentation of the matter, the action is one of straightforward vengeance. The natural avenger is the brother for a sister and a husband for a wife. Such an attempt will certainly be made where an avenger is available, and it will be recalled that in the case of unmarried girls one of the brothers does not marry until all the sisters are

[4] It seems to be the opinion that the father who begot the girl is a more appropriate executioner than the brother.

[5] Marriage is not an honourable solution to a premarital affair unless, as is most unlikely, the liaison is known only to the two families, and not to the community.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

established in marriage, an arrangement which expressly provides them with this avenger. Consequently, in cases where an act of vengeance concerns the sexual honour of a sister or a wife, there is little chance of it not being executed through default of a ready avenger.

A question of honour is also involved when a man breaks the contract of betrothal. The girl's brother ought to kill him. Here the attack on the girl and her family is not a physical assault upon her virginity, but the suggestion that in this or some other respect she is not worthy of marriage. And the knowledge that the breaking of the contract involves an obligation of vengeance only establishes more strongly in the minds of other members of the community the suspicion that there must exist some serious fault in the girl. I know of only two instances of broken betrothals over a period of ten years and significantly both these cases were arrangements between Sarakatsan girls and village men. Marriages between Sarakatsani are only arranged after exhaustive inquiry and considerable debate; mistakes are thus unlikely. In the first of these two cases, the former bridegroom fled to Athens after he had lost the top of a finger in an unsuccessful attempt on his life; in the second case, the father of the unhappy girl had no adult son, and was glad enough to have the additional excuse that the man lived some considerable distance away. He was loud in his threats, but in the event he did nothing; and people were quick to point out that this was exactly the kind of conduct one might have expected from this particular individual.

Between the two categories of 'affairs of honour' which I have described there is one important difference. In the first category, a killing demands a counter killing, and in theory, at least, this process may continue until all the adult male members of the two families have exterminated one another. The first killing which initiates the affair is not itself a random or indiscriminate act. It happens generally as the reply to an insult or as the consequence of a boundary dispute or some other quarrel. A man does not intend to kill in these situations, but accidents happen. The rough balance which in most cases, as we have seen, is struck between the two sides, satisfies neither group. The community remains relatively indifferent to questions of 'right' and gives its preference to the side which shows the greater manliness.

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

596 the greater manliness. In the second category, however, where
577 an affair concerns the sexual honour of a woman, the community
627 strongly upholds the 'right', in an ethical sense, of a family to
● 689 kill a man who has assaulted one of its women. For this act is
626 evil and dishonourable. An avenger in an affair of the second category does not generally go into exile, since his life is to a degree protected by public opinion. Where a balance is struck between the two groups in affairs of family honour, it is inherently less stable in cases of the first category than in those of the second. And this appears in the fact that two families, between whom there is a killing and an exile, are extremely careful to avoid meeting in circumstances where their presence may represent an affront to one another. Mutual avoidance is a means of preventing the disturbance of a precarious equilibrium. It appears, then, that the processes of vengeance provide through exile a sanction against killing, and through vengeance killing a sanction against breaches of the code of sexual behaviour.

596 When a man is killed or a woman is assaulted something, a
577 life or honour, is taken away, not merely from the violated
627 individual, but more importantly from his family. One group has committed a wanton and hostile act upon the other, and between the two groups a debt of honour now exists. Something has been taken, something equivalent must be taken back. Until some kind of a balance is re-established, the victim's family is in the eyes of the community inferior to the group of the violator, even where the act of outrage, as in the case of sexual assault, is in itself evil.

It is a peculiarity of 'affairs of honour' that they consist of at least two events between which some interval of time elapses. The first is the violation of family honour which is generally an outrage on one particular member; the second is the act of vengeance which is similarly performed, in most cases, by one member only. In both instances the individual as victim or avenger represents his family. If the honour of the individual and the honour of the family are analytically separable, in
[554] action they are one. And if the execution of vengeance brings a measure of personal glory to the individual, at the same time it is also an act which is essentially altruistic.

[558] The longer the interval of time between the two events the

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

577 and the strength that is drawn from them. The word also describes a certain ruthless ability in any form of endeavour. Here again we see the 'efficient' aspect of manliness. But βαρβάτος is in no sense a moral term, and in other contexts it may describe the dishonourable conduct of a man who rapes a woman or bullies weaker men. The manliness that is related to honour requires this physical basis, yet it must discipline animal strength and passions to its own ideal ends.

577 The quality required of women in relation to honour is 831 shame (ντροπή), particularly sexual shame. Subjectively the 834 woman's sexual shame is not simply a fear of external sanctions; 562 it is an instinctive revulsion from sexual activity, an attempt in dress, movement, and attitude, to disguise the fact that she possesses the physical attributes of her sex. Maidens must be virgins, and even married women must remain virginal in thought and expression. But honour is always something imputed by others. In these matters the individual woman can never retreat within her own conscience. Her honour depends upon the reputation which the community is willing to concede, not upon the evidence of facts in any case difficult to determine. Therefore she protects her honour most effectively by conforming in every outward aspect of her deportment to a code of sexual shame. The woman who succeeds in this is τίμια and τιμημένη, honourable and honoured; but, if she fails, she is ἀδιάντροπη, shameless, and σκύλλα, a bitch, a woman without restraint, whose behaviour is compounded of the reflexes of her animal instincts. She becomes 'used' (μεταχειρισμένη), if only on the lips of men, and therefore 'lost' (χαμένη).

577 562 593 831 684 The sexual shame of women is no doubt related to the ambivalent attitude of the Sarakatsani towards sexual relations even in marriage. But it is also consistent with the importance of legitimacy as the essential qualification for membership in the family group. The sexual, reproductive, and working capacities of women belong exclusively to their families; and there is no more certain way of defiling the honour of another family than by seducing one of its women, particularly since mixed attitudes of awe and shame surround the sexual act and the reproductive life process. There is double cause for shame. Something of intimate spiritual value is rifled and desecrated by a stranger while at the same time the moral

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

blame for this loss is generally ascribed by the community to the sensuality of the woman and, by extension, to the moral weakness of her kinsmen.

This kind of shame is a quality that is thought to descend in the female line from mother to daughter, but its loss always implicates the honour of the men of the family, reflecting on the manliness of the husband, and, more generally, on the whole social personality of brothers and, particularly, sons. The woman is soiled, λερωμένη, and blackened, μουντζουρωμένη; and she marks with her dishonour all those who are close to her through kinship or marriage. Essentially, sexual shame is felt to be an inborn moral characteristic, part of a woman's personality. Conventional deportment requires training of course; but however thorough her education the true character of a naturally shameless woman is certain to emerge, for fundamentally sexual shame is a question of heredity. If it becomes known that a young maiden has been struck by her father or brother because of some immodesty, people laugh and ask rhetorically what good do they imagine this will do since the fault proceeds from her mother.

Clearly manliness and shame are complementary qualities in relation to honour. The manliness of the men in any family protects the sexual honour of its women from external insult or outrage. The women must have shame if the manliness of the men is not to be dishonoured. We saw in an earlier chapter how the dishonour of a mother cannot be remedied by the sons. It is true that when a man kills a daughter who has lost her honour he wins the grudging respect of the community; yet, at the same time, the dishonour of the family is never entirely forgotten. Even when the rape of a sister has been avenged, a measure of dishonour remains, the dishonour of the girl's failure to preserve her virginity. The reputation for manliness of the men of the family is a deterrent against external outrage, but it cannot entirely repair the damage if such an attack against its women proves successful. It is, then, not surprising that the worst insult that can be aimed at a man is to use the name of his sister, or mother, in an unpleasant sexual context.

Honour considered as the possession by men and women of these qualities is the attempt to relate existence to certain

1:Campbell E-5 (1954-1955)1964
EH14 Sarakatsani EH14
Zagori

a makeweight that balances various shortcomings in the bride whether these refer to the prestige ranking of her family, or to some personal inadequacy, or both. The virtuous daughter of Leonidas Gogolos was the victim of a road accident when she was a small girl. She walks with a limp, and her leg, below the knee, is pitifully thin and ugly with scar tissue. But it is generally believed that she will not remain unmarried if her father is willing to give her to a man of undistinguished family together with a dowry of 50 sheep.

In some instances brides are taken without dowry-wealth. Necessarily, marriages between poor families are generally contracted without dowry-wealth. And it sometimes happens that a family of wealth, when it takes a girl from a less affluent group, may, with a gesture of pride, waive the question of dowry-wealth. Pride, however, may also work in the opposite direction. A family of the 'first lineage' was asked for dowry-wealth of fifty sheep by a suitor of good repute. To show his wealth, to make plain the superiority of his family, and to place the groom under obligation to him, the father of the girl gave a hundred.

It is always said in general discussions of the matter that a girl who loses her honour, if she is not killed by her father, will never marry. The few cases of such women in the community do not support this statement. The wife of George Raftis was the daughter of a family of high repute. It is alleged that when she was a young woman she was seduced by a member of a wealthy and powerful Tsoumanis family which pastured its sheep on the land of the same summer village. The family did not dare to attack this powerful group, nor did they have the necessary resolve to execute the girl. Although the girl's family was of respectable lineage and some wealth, the loss of her honour and the inactivity of its men utterly destroyed its reputation. But finally, at the age of 39, the woman was sought in marriage by Raftis, a poor man of no standing, a wage shepherd with a handful of sheep whose wife had died leaving him with two young daughters.

Marriage to a widower is always a possibility for women whose eligibility for marriage is in some way anomalous. There is little prestige in marrying a widower, and the fathers of respectable families do not normally entertain the idea of

536 pair then retired to a hut, and to the hilarity of all,
522 comic simulacra of considerable indecency were
831 enacted within. But the groom was found wanting
and thrown out; candidate after candidate entered
with apparent promise, and each one in turn was
[533] ejected in disgrace. A fitting champion was dis-
covered at last, and during a final mime of tri-
umphant bawdiness, the entire company danced
around the hut singing "The Pepper Song," the
dancers alternately banging their noses and their
rumps on the ground with a seesaw motion I
would give much to observe.

851 THE feast of St. George is the most propitious
553 for christenings, and babies born immediately
[794] afterward often have to wait for a year to be bap-
[775] tized. But they are always named at once, and
should they fall ill, they are given a lay baptism
on the spot, lest they should die and turn into little
163 vampires. The average family varies between
848 five and fifteen children. Random fornication,
● [684] adultery, divorce, rape, and bastardy are un-
known, and should a case of bastardy ever crop
up, death to all concerned is the only remedy.
This is not only for reasons of morality, for these
ill-starred children are thought to be Satan per-
[725] sonified; they bring a curse on the huts, and should
one grow up and die a natural death, a ghost rises

29
53
301

[p.84 A]

848 /142 cont./
578 a dispute of this kind could only engender disorder, even the dis-
602 solution of the group.

848 It is, moreover, within this same complex of ideas that we must
684 seek the justification of the sanction which is imposed on any woman convicted of adultery and which always means death. It is essential, [593] first of all, to prevent even the possibility of illegitimate children. [152] Sarakatsani law that threatens with capital punishment the women who betray conjugal fidelity, does not seek to punish the flouting of love, [182] since love does not exist between spouses--at least officially. It merely preserves the integrity of Sarakatsani society.

The Life Style of the Conjugal Family.

855 The presence of children in the family raises a whole series
594 of questions dealing with their education, their status and their relations with each other as well as with their parents.

855 Up to the age of approximately ten years the children of both
593 sexes grow up together under the vigilance of their mother. That is
594 the period of their lives when, on the one hand, the father is seldom involved and, on the other hand, bonds are established between them
855 and with their mother. /143/ Having reached this age, the boys begin
593 to follow their father and their older brothers in order to learn the
818 methods of herding, while the girls remain close to their mother in
868 order to be initiated into the mysteries of the distaff and the loom.
594

593 Toward their father all the children without distinction owe
594 absolute obedience and devotion. The study of marriage has sufficiently shown this.

Toward their mother the girls likewise owe obedience and devotion.

For the sons the situation is different. We were present at the return to the parental hut after a long absence of a Sarakatsani son aged 30 years. We remember vividly the scene of his meeting with his mother, which made a great impression on us. He bowed to her and kissed her hand.

/219 cont./
though their nature in this respect were different from that of other human beings. Yet it must be acknowledged, nevertheless, that such relations are extremely rare.

The woman, young girl or wife, who carries on illicit relations risks being put to death either by her relatives or by her husband and the latter's relatives. Though marriage with the partner might possibly, if rarely, let the girl escape punishment, an adulterous woman is invariably punished.

Her lover too is exposed to the same punishment, the carrying out of which is incumbent on the relatives of the woman.

The Sarakatsani maintain that the justification for this severe punishment lies in the fact that the act of the woman (young girl or wife) dishonors her family or her husband and his relatives, and that only blood can wash away the stain.

Moreover, this conviction is not peculiar to our herders; one finds it all over Greece. In our opinion this is an /220/ ideological sublimation of two principles: that of the societal control of individuals with regard to marriage, and that of the control of the legitimacy of descent, of which we have spoken above.

Observation shows that this belief in "wounded honor" as well as the drama that it provokes recede and diminish to the extent the children, the girls above all, free themselves from paternal and family authority in the matter of marriage and marry according to their own choice.

If a lover is not punished by his own relatives for his illegitimate acts it is because, in a system dominated by pronounced patriarchy, the man is a privileged being to whom everything is permitted--a version obviously not acceptable to the relatives of the woman who accuse him of having ruined her.

However, in such a case, the comments, regardless of who makes them, are much more severe towards the woman than towards her accomplice who

837 /220 cont./
577 "in the end is a man and is only seeking his pleasure."
577
632 Rape and abduction of a young girl.

684 These two acts are also punished with death by the relatives of the victim. But they too are extremely rare.

583 The kidnapping, the abduction of a young girl usually is a form of
584 vengeance. It happens that a suitor whose proposals have been evaded by
627 the relatives of the young girl avenges himself by carrying her off
[584] forcibly with the help of his friends.

However, if the abductor then does not consent to marry her the men of the victim's family have the duty to kill him. The justification for the punishment resides in the principles which have been set forth above.

685 The theft of animals.
[694] This act is either a crime or an exploit according to circumstances.
[693] If the thief is caught in the act he is killed on the spot by the shepherds watching their flocks. If he is identified after the deed he must give up the stolen animals in order to acquit hemself. If he refuses, he risks being either killed by the injured shepherds or of being deprived of part of his flock in retaliation.

685 /221/ However, an animal thief not caught is the subject of admiration
555 by all, even his victims. For it is not easy to carry off his exploit. In
577 order to manage it, the thief must crawl and climb, without noise in the dark of night without a moon, across gorges and rocks, elude the watch of armed shepherds, escape the scent of the terrible dogs capable of tearing him to shreds in an instant, carry off the sheep without having them bleat of sound their bells, and disappear with them silently into the night.

685 On the other hand, to steal animals in a fixed sheepfold of the winter
577 camp is a shameful act that brings disgrace to the one guilty of it.

685 Finally, this code, so to speak, regarding animal theft implies another
577 rule:
783 The thief unidentified and therefore unpunished is in any case

/237 cont./

577 121

2. Definition of the moral phenomenon in Sociology et Philosophie /Sociology and Philosophy/, p. 49 f.

said, emphasizing the methodological prerequisite necessary for any study of moral phenomena.

Now if it is true that morality is a sum total of ideas by which behavior must be prompted, if these ideas represent values, and if behavior which does not conform to them is socially disapproved, /then/ these assertions, expressed concretely in terms of Sarakatsani reality, are sufficient to guide our research. They must also determine the outline of this chapter.

* * * *

577 The fundamental values of Sarakatsani morality are the family, chastity, the "community," tradition, finally insubordination.

The analysis of the aspects of their lives that we have studied up to now testifies to this. Everything that has to do with the family (descent, relations of all kinds between its members, including economic relations) is intimately bound up with morality. /238/ Chastity involves 577 831 the control of sexuality in its known forms, the prohibition of adultery, the guarantee of the legitimacy of descendants, the virginity requirement and very strict morals imposed on young girls. Although this subject is connected with the family, we shall emphasize it particularly, in view of its importance for the Sarakatsani. When they speak of morality they are [684] referring to sexual life. Moreover, an assault against decency and virtue is considered by them as more grave morally than an attack on a person's life. If a woman is sexually abused, the infamy falls on all the members of her family whose honor is thereafter tarnished. Honor and sexuality go [171] together among our herders, as they do, in fact, in all of Greece. In the [195] context of the same ideas, discussion and allusions relating to sexuality are systematically avoided, although frank speech is common among persons [834] of the same age and the same sex. But it is necessary to be reserved toward [788] [684]